

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

CULTURAL CHANGES REQUIRED IN THE ARMY TO TRULY  
ACHIEVE A TOTAL FORCE

by

John Gobrick, LTC, USAR

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: COL Mike Dvoracek

16 February 2016

## **DISCLAIMER**

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government, the Department of Defense, or Air University. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.



## **Biography**

LTC John Gobrick is assigned to the Air War College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL. An Army Reserve, Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) officer, LTC Gobrick has held a variety of command and staff positions culminating in his last assignment prior to Air War College as Battalion Commander, Support Battalion, 196<sup>th</sup> Infantry Brigade, Fort Shafter, HI.



## **Abstract**

This research paper uses a qualitative approach to argue that while efforts by senior leaders to incorporate the Army Reserve as a partner in an interdependent Total Force have been significant, no attempts have been made to address the underlying cultural differences between the components. In order to make long lasting changes to an organization, leaders must act now to address the underlying cultural differences between the two components and transform both to a shared culture. Otherwise, recent progress that has been achieved towards a Total Force could be destined to fail. This paper argues for implementing four recommendations to forge a common Army culture and institutionalize the progress that has already been made towards the Total Force concept.

The first recommendation is to increase marketing, recruitment, and leadership communication in the Army Reserve. This increase would emphasize the Army Reserve as an operational force and dispel the notion of a “weekend warrior”. This would build trust in the reserve components and provide reserve component Soldiers with realistic expectations of their service and help them to be better prepared when they are called to deploy.

The second recommendation is to reorganize the Title XI support to the Army Reserve by disestablishing the active Army’s training support structure and harvesting those positions into operational multicomponent units and embedded positions throughout the Army Reserve. The result would significantly increase the readiness of the Army Reserve and the development of a shared culture by moving personnel to where they can have the biggest impact on the unit while ensuring a cross pollination of both component’s cultures and experiences.

The third recommendation is to make Title XI support for the Army Reserve competitively selected. This would ensure that only the best were selected and foster an exchange of both component's cultures and experiences to further achieve a shared culture.

The final recommendation is to re-implement the exchange of Command Selection List (CSL) designees for battalion and above commands between components. This would provide each designee a lasting understanding of the capabilities and unique challenges that each component faces. Furthermore, it exposes those with the most potential to move up to the general officer ranks in their respective component. Thus providing an enormous potential to drive change and institutionalize the Total Force concept.



“As one total force, the active Army, Army National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve provide operating and generating forces to support the National Military Strategy and Army commitments worldwide. The Army will ensure that the total force is organized, trained, sustained, equipped and employed to support combatant commander requirements as force packages tailored to achieve anticipated objectives.”<sup>1</sup>

Honorable John M. McHugh,  
Secretary of the Army  
Army Directive 2012-08 (Army Total Force Policy)

“Think multicomponent in everything we do.”<sup>2</sup>

General Mark Milley  
Chief of Staff, Army

“The Army can’t meet its missions without the Army Reserve. Our culture is about service to the Army. We are one total force.”<sup>3</sup>

Lieutenant General Jeffrey Talley  
Chief, Army Reserve

The Army senior leadership’s intent for the Total Force concept in implementing the Army’s Force 2025 and beyond strategy to “ensure the future joint force can win in a complex world”<sup>4</sup> is clear. The active Army, Army Reserve, and the Army National Guard will be employed as an integrated force<sup>5</sup>.

Although the Total Force concept has been a goal since 1973, the Army has historically fallen short of achieving it. The active Army, as the dominant partner with the responsibility of distributing resources, has alternated between two approaches towards the Army Reserve; dismissing the capabilities and utility of Army Reserve units, or “trying to figure out how to enhance the operational readiness of these units through various strategies and providing more money for equipment and training”<sup>6</sup>. However, “deeply embedded assumptions”<sup>7</sup> about the lack of utility of the Army Reserve always hindered attempts to fully integrate the components.

The extensive use of the Army Reserve in the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts in the past 15 years has provided significant progress towards achieving the goal envisioned by the Army's leadership. In Iraq and Afghanistan, both the active Army and Army Reserve embraced the Total Force concept and fought side by side successfully. This successful partnership proved that the Army Reserve was, and is, capable of executing its assigned missions and earned the trust of the active Army. As Lieutenant General Talley, Chief of the Army Reserve fittingly described, "Never before in the history of our Nation has the Army Reserve been more indispensable to the Army and the Joint Force."<sup>8</sup>

Despite the enormous progress, there is a danger that these advancements to fully achieve a Total Force could be lost. While the efforts by senior leaders to incorporate the Army Reserve as a partner in an interdependent Total Force has been significant, no attempts have been made to address the underlying cultural differences between the components. Edgar Schein, an organizational culture expert, pointed out that in order to make long lasting changes to an organization, leaders have to change the underlying culture<sup>9</sup>. Otherwise, the recent progress that has been achieved towards a Total Force could be destined to fail.

To avoid reverting back to the days of the reluctant use of the Army Reserve, the active Army and Army Reserve need to act now and implement enduring cultural changes. Leaders must invest the time and effort to address the underlying cultural differences between the two components and transform both to a shared culture. This must happen if we truly want to have an operational Army Reserve and interdependent Total Force.

## CULTURES OF THE ACTIVE ARMY AND ARMY RESERVE

Edgar Schein defines culture as “shared norms, values, and assumptions.”<sup>10</sup> In other words, culture relates to rules about how things are done in an organization using a “common language, common knowledge and norms of behavior.”<sup>11</sup> Culture is “less easily studied than defined.”<sup>12</sup> Therefore, it is difficult to find concrete examples of the cultural barriers to a true Total Force. Because of this difficulty in finding these examples, especially for military organizations, I am forced to draw mainly from inferences which are based on my experiences and those of peers. In order for changes to take hold, it is imperative to understand the different cultural paradigms that exist in each organization.

The active Army and Army Reserve share many of the same cultural foundations. While not a comprehensive list, each places great importance on traditions, customs, esprit de corps, and personnel readiness. Both cherish and uphold the key values of leadership, duty, respect, selfless service, honesty, integrity and personal courage<sup>13</sup>. Finally, like most bureaucracies, when changes are proposed both share a tendency for “foot dragging, reluctance, and divisiveness.”<sup>14</sup> Both are generally resistant to change.

While there are several differences in cultural norms between the components, I would like to highlight four distinct examples: (1) The Army Reserve paradigm of serving only one weekend a month and two weeks of Annual Training, (2) The impact of civilian military technicians on the Army Reserve military hierarchical power structure, (3) The tendency to over schedule training on a training schedule, and (4) The perception that the Army Reserve is less professional and capable than their active Army counterparts.

Even today, after 15 years of nearly continuous deployments and the increasing demands of an operational Army Reserve, there continues to be a culture that highlights Reserve duty as a

one weekend a month, two weeks a year commitment. This misrepresentation is prevalent not only in the interactions of Soldiers who are currently members of the Army Reserve, but also with prospective Soldiers. One just needs to look at the Army Reserve recruiting website and see that the recruiting pitch highlights this predictable schedule while downplaying the reality of deployments as part of the operational Army Reserve<sup>15</sup>. In fact, each Army Reservist has deployed on average 1.45 times during Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), a number which does not include the significant amount of deployments within the United States<sup>16</sup>.

Another facet to the paradigm of duty in the Army Reserve is the balance that exists between a civilian career and military training for a traditional Army Reservist. Maintaining the balance between the two is a tension that impacts the service of the majority of Soldiers in the Army Reserve. While technically protected by law from firing or discrimination due to their Reserve commitment, Army Reserve Soldiers understand that some employers will apply pressure to reduce their participation. Though the vast majority of employers throughout the past 15 years have been supportive of their employees' deployments<sup>17</sup>, the possibility of being passed over for advancement or otherwise discriminated against by their primary source of income has significant impact.

The next paradigm is the impact that civilian military technicians have on the Army Reserve military hierarchical power structure. The fulltime staff in Army Reserve organizations generally fall into four categories; Active Guard Reserve (AGR), Active Component (AC), Department of the Army Civilians (DAC), and dual status Technicians. The dual status signifies that as part of their civilian employment, technicians are required to have a simultaneous membership in the Army Reserve, typically in the same unit. The vast majority of Army

Reserve organizations will never have AC Soldiers or DACs, so AGRs and technicians make up the overwhelming majority of full time staff in most Reserve units. Since AGRs move to new jobs and new duty locations at regular intervals and dual status technicians generally stay in the unit for much longer periods, technicians are relied upon to provide continuity and institutional memory for the organization. Furthermore, while there is “no DOD/DA policy, which outlines comparative or equivalent military rank to civilian grade structure for the purposes of day-to-day operational control of a unit,”<sup>18</sup> generally technicians view their role as the representative of the commander and have day to day operational control of Army Reserve organizations.

Unit commanders in the Army Reserve are generally part time reservists and rely on the full time staff to manage the unit’s day to day operations. The dynamic of a full time technician can significantly impact the typical hierarchical leadership structure of Army Reserve units. If an AGR Soldier is not performing to standard, the fix is relatively simple. The unit commander or staff supervisor has authority over them by virtue of their position and rank. When technicians are not performing to standard, the solution is often not so straightforward. This is especially true when coupled with a technician who has substantial longevity in a unit and a common misperception that you cannot fire them<sup>19</sup>. Another facet to this dilemma is dealing with a Soldier that happens to have an influential position for their civilian technician job elsewhere in the organization. For example, a battalion S1<sup>20</sup> officer, who is generally part time, dealing with a substandard Soldier in his section who also happens to be the battalion supervisory staff administrator (SSA) who, in their civilian capacity, is the commander’s day to day representative.

For Reserve leaders, being part time and attempting to balance military priorities with their civilian responsibilities while confronting a subordinate technician who is at the unit day to

day can be quite challenging. The majority of technicians are dedicated professionals who adhere to a commander's intent. However, this is not always the case and those unit commanders either have to expend a significant portion of time, which they may not have due to their civilian job responsibilities, to address the discrepancy or abdicate their authority.

One example of the impact technicians can have on the military hierarchical power structure was during my tenure as the commander of a training support battalion. My battalion provided training support and assistance to Army Reserve units within our area of responsibility. One unit had a company that was struggling. This company had a crucial mission that was essential to an entire theater. The G3<sup>21</sup> of the command requested that I focus my efforts on this unit. I discovered the unit's issues revolved mainly around a weak company commander. He was neither effective in articulating his intent nor in leading his unit and he wasn't motivated to improve. Attempts to spur improvement were to no avail. The battalion commander, a TPU<sup>22</sup> Soldier, concurred with the poor assessment and conveyed similar concerns. The unit was two years behind in its training glide path and the battalion commander considered relieving the company commander. However, the battalion commander decided not to relieve him and to let him ride out his remaining one year. He stated that his decision was largely based on the fact that the company commander had a senior technician position in the G1. The battalion commander felt that the company commander could use his civilian position to cause him trouble should he relieve him from command.

The next difference in cultural norms between the components is the tendency in the Army Reserve to pack in as many events as possible during battle assemblies and annual trainings.<sup>23</sup> This is done in an attempt to try and maximize the limited training time that the Army Reserve has available. The result is a very high pace of activity, or OPTEMPO<sup>24</sup>, which

makes these events draining, especially for those in a leadership role. Units have only 39 training days a year to accomplish nearly the same requirements as the active Army. The results express themselves on unit training schedules where it is not uncommon to see units attempt to train on multiple mission essential tasks during a battle assembly. Active army units, though not unconstrained, tend to have additional time to lay out a more patient approach to training management.

An example of this cultural norm to pack in events occurred during my deployment with the 143<sup>rd</sup> TRANSCOM in 2005. During the daily Battle Update Briefs (BUB) with the commanding general, the chief of staff, an Army Reservist, would often schedule multiple events (recognitions, award ceremonies, etc.) either immediately preceding or immediately following the brief. It was very evident that the deputy commander, an active Army officer, was not fond of these events taking place during the BUB. He pulled the chief of staff aside and confronted him with his concerns that the appropriate time to schedule these events was as a separate engagement. These two colonel's heatedly discussed the issue but weren't coming to a resolution. Finally, the G3, who was also an Army Reservist but had substantial active component time, told them that they were talking past each other because they came from two separate cultures. He went on to explain that the cultural background and formative development of the chief of staff's career was to maximize every bit of time and seize every available opportunity in a battle assembly. The active component simply didn't have this experience to shape their development so were much less likely to pack multiple tasks into an event.

The final cultural norm is the perception that the Army Reserve is less capable or professional than their active Army counterpart. When this perception manifests itself from the active Army it is often as an, "I do this every day so I know better" attitude. Though not the

intent, Title XI<sup>25</sup> training support from active Army Training Support organizations like First Army, reinforces this perception. They “advise, assist, and train”<sup>26</sup> Army Reserve units. However, their role as outside advisors and trainers lends credence to the perception that Army Reserve units are less capable which permeates throughout the Army. I have personally experienced this negative perception of being less capable than my active Army counterparts several times during my career.

On the first day of a training block on sustainment during resident Intermediate Level Education (ILE), the instructor pulled the two logisticians in the small group aside; me, an Army Reservist, and my active Army colleague. We were instructed to depict for the class the laydown of sustainment from the foxhole to the strategic industrial base. As a professional logistician, I knew the answer and verbally depicted the doctrinal answer that we should use. My colleague stated that I was wrong. When I protested, he replied, “I’m regular Army and do this every day. I know what I’m talking about.” He then proceeded to layout the incorrect version. When the instructor returned with the rest of the class, he dismissed the incorrect answer and demonstrated the exact formations that I had previously described. My colleague’s perception of Army Reservists was changed that day and he discovered that we are just as good as our active duty counterparts.

Surprisingly, it seems the perception that the active Army is better not only resides in the active Army about the Army Reserve, but also in the Army Reserve itself. Clearly, the message from the past 15 years regarding the Army Reserve being a vital and operational part of the professional Total Force has not gotten through to everyone. It can be overheard from Army Reserve Soldiers depicting their skills and those of the Army Reserve as less professional or not up to the standards.<sup>27</sup> These perceptions of being less professional and just a “weekend warrior”

run deep and trace their roots back to the Revolutionary War.<sup>28</sup> Probably the biggest contributor to the perception was the Vietnam War. President Johnson's decision not to mobilize the Army Reserve significantly damaged its reputation because, as there was no danger of mobilizing, the Army Reserve became a safe haven for those wanting to avoid service in Vietnam.<sup>29</sup> Despite multiple instances of the Army Reserve proving its worth these past 15 years, with the long institutional memory of the Army, the ghosts of the past are hard to stamp out.

### LESSONS LEARNED FROM OTHER SERVICES

There are perhaps lessons to be learned from other service's relationships with their Reserve components and their efforts toward achieving a shared culture. The Navy has made significant strides from the past where "Reservist" carried with it a negative connotation and in developing a "culture of the future."<sup>30</sup> Changes have been made to their forces so that now there "are no Naval Reserve requirements, there are only Navy requirements."<sup>31</sup> As a result, there now exists an overall integrated Navy culture.

While the Navy has been rather successful in integrating their two components into one culture, there may not be a practical application of their approach for the Army Reserve. The Naval Reserve component serves as a provider of individual augmentation to the active Navy whereas the Army Reserve's focus is mainly to provide cohesive units to meet operational demands.

The Marine Corps has several lessons that could be useful to the Army in developing a shared culture. They portray an almost complete Total Force mindset, driven in part due to their fundamental core principle of "being a Marine matters more than what component one serves in."<sup>32</sup> As reinforcement to this mindset, the Marine Corps made "reserve integration" one of the

core competencies published in their foundational strategy for the Marine Corps. In contrast, while the active Army has inserted Total Force integration into the Army Operating Concept<sup>33</sup>, it has not made the same level of commitment by making it a core competency.

The next factor towards a shared Marine culture is their Inspector- Instructor (I&I) initiative. Active Marines are embedded in reserve Marine units to serve as an organic part of the unit. This initiative has several lessons that could be of practical use for the Army. First, active duty Marines are competitively selected so that only the best serve in support of the Marine Reserves. Second, the active Marine provides his/her perspective and expertise to the reserve unit, and when he or she transfers to their next job the familiarity and experience of the reserve component is brought to his next duty station so that it can be cross pollinated<sup>34</sup>.

The Air Force has also been successful in forging a common Air Force culture through the Future Total Force (FTF) concept, which combines force structure through the use of shared platforms<sup>35</sup>. Though an individual platform focus may have limited utility for the Army, the use of combined units better known as Total Force Initiative (TFI) units does have potential. This is due to TFIs influence towards development of a shared culture by the broadening effects on its members from exposure to the other components. Another useful lesson in the Air Force's successful transition to a total force culture is their reliance on their reserve components for entire segments of basic training. For example, most of the Air Force training for C-130 transport aircraft is conducted by the Arkansas Air National Guard.<sup>36</sup>

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following four recommendations are tangible advancements towards forging a shared culture and institutionalizing the progress that has already been made towards the Total Force concept.

The first recommendation is to increase marketing, recruitment, and leadership communication in the Army Reserve. This increase would emphasize the Army Reserve as an operational force and dispel the notion of a “weekend warrior”. Dispelling the perception of Army Reserve Soldiers as “weekend warriors” will benefit the Army Reserve and active Army in two ways. First, it will provide the active Army with confidence that Army Reserve Soldiers are fully committed to being part of a required operational force. This will subsequently help the active Army build upon the trust they have in the Army Reserve. Second, providing Army Reserve Soldiers with realistic expectations of their service will help them to be better prepared when they are called to deploy.

Detractors may point out that the emphasis on being operational, rather than part time, could cause the Army Reserve to lose soldiers due to concerns of conflict with civilian employers. While it is not certain if this will occur in the future, our recent experiences after 9/11 indicate that there would be little effect. As Major General MacCarley, an Army Reservist who served as the deputy chief of staff for Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), pointed out “those who answered the call after 9/11 wanted to serve, and confirmed that commitment by unhesitatingly deploying overseas and, for the most part, stoically accepting the consequences of deployment upon their families and their civilian careers”<sup>37</sup>

The next recommendation for making the Total Force concept a reality advocates a reorganization of the Title XI support to the Army Reserve by disestablishing the active Army’s

training support structure and harvesting those positions into operational multicomponent units<sup>38</sup> and embedded positions throughout the Army Reserve. A significant shortcoming of the current approach of advising, assisting, and training for training support organizations is that there is no “skin in the game” for them. As advisors, they are not held accountable for the readiness of their partnered units and their role as an outsider from the active component is highlighted.

Unfortunately, the recognition of this reality does not advance a shared culture but rather a hardening of the separate natures of the two components.

The manning of First Army, which consists of personnel from one army headquarters, two divisions, nine brigades, and forty-nine battalions, represents an enormous reservoir of expertise. These Active component Soldiers, if embedded throughout the Army Reserve force structure, would significantly increase the readiness of the Army Reserve and the development of a shared culture. Making these Soldiers part of the Army Reserve unit would provide for them an inherent motivation to make the unit as ready as possible. If deployed with the unit, their lives could depend on their efforts. Furthermore, by placing these Soldiers directly into units where they can make the most impact negates the need for the additional training support force structure. The reduction in this force structure, in light of reduced resources, has enormous potential for cost savings and increased readiness.

Detractors could argue that removing training support units in their advise and assist role would prove detrimental to the readiness of these units by removing the external feedback on their training. However, the capability for providing external feedback already resides in the organic force structure of the Army Reserve and would be further enhanced by the influx of additional AC Soldiers to the staffs of Army Reserve units. Furthermore, this organic force

structure provides an inherent mission command capability to ensure accountability and improvement in training readiness which currently isn't provided by training support units.

The third recommendation for institutionalizing cultural integration is to make active Army Soldier assignments to Army Reserve or operational multicomponent units competitively selected. Using the Marine Corps I&I program as a successful model, ensuring that Title XI support was selected competitively would have the same effects. Like the Marine Corps, this would ensure that only the best qualified would serve in the Army Reserve. This would reduce the stigma of serving in the Army Reserve by changing the paradigm that an assignment to it was a career dead end.<sup>39</sup> Also, like the above recommendation to embed additional Active component Soldiers throughout the Army Reserve force structure, this proposal would increase the exchange of both component's cultures and experiences to further achieve a shared culture.

One possible argument against this recommendation could be the cost, both financial and bureaucratic, in administering a competitive selection process. However, any potential costs would be more than offset by the benefits of the increased quality and cross pollination between the two cultures that would occur if implemented.

The final recommendation is exchange of command selection list (CSL) designees for battalion and above commands to command in the other component. This is not a new idea. During the 1990's this was a pilot program which sent active component commanders to reserve component units and vice versa but was discontinued. Major General Mark Graham, the first active Army colonel to command a National Guard brigade in peacetime is a successful example of this program.<sup>40</sup> Another example is the most recent Chief of Staff of the United States Army Reserve Command, Major General Luis Visot, a traditional TPU Army Reservist.

Re-implementing this initiative would have several benefits. The first, as in my earlier recommendations, is that each component would gain the perspectives and experiences of the other which, in turn, would help foster the development of a shared culture. The proverbial ability to walk a mile in someone else's shoes, especially in these key command positions, would provide a lasting understanding of the capabilities and unique challenges that each component faces. Commanders who were selected could then bring this understanding back to their respective component.

The second, and perhaps the most important benefit, is that these CSL officers have the most potential in their respective components to move up to the general officer ranks. This allows them to directly impact the policies of their respective components and provides an enormous potential to drive change and institutionalize the Total Force concept.

For example, MG Visot's experience as a battalion commander of an Active component unit "set him up"<sup>41</sup> for General Officer and helped tremendously to "develop, nurture, and establish relationships that facilitated the engagement"<sup>42</sup> with AC units during his deployment during OIF. He stated that he was successful, in part, with AC units because of the trust and confidence that was built during his tenure as a battalion commander. "I was a known entity"<sup>43</sup> and "the AC Soldiers knew who I was."<sup>44</sup> This was made possible because of the relationships he developed during his AC battalion command.

Finally, re-implementing the initiative would provide a tangible benchmark on the Army's efforts toward the Total Force concept and further institutionalize the effort. While statements by the senior leadership of each component are clear on their seriousness towards achieving a Total Force, we only need to look back to the 1990's, when shrinking budgets and

differing priorities led to an every man for himself mentality, to see how quickly changes can occur.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The past 15 years has led to a better understanding and fostered a mutual trust between the active Army and Army Reserve through shared operational experiences. The enhanced reputation of the Army Reserve has “introduced a new paradigm of reliance…as an essential part of our national security architecture”<sup>45</sup> and has led the Army Reserve to the highest level of capabilities and professionalism that I’ve seen in my 26 years of service. The statements by senior leadership to “think multi-component in everything we do”<sup>46</sup> are positive and vital steps towards a truly integrated Total Force. However, without implementing the changes that would create an enduring shared culture between the Army Reserve and Active Component, we would remain an “unintegrated culture”<sup>47</sup> dooming any lasting attempt to failure.

As resources become scarce, the active Army, who is the dominant partner, could shortchange an operational Army Reserve by diverting resources to itself. This could force the Army Reserve back to a strategic reserve which would lead again to a perception of the “weekend warrior” and reluctant use of the Army Reserve.

The risk of not changing is too great. The active Army cannot sustain major combat operations without the Army Reserve and allowing the hard fought gains towards the Total Force concept to atrophy could result in catastrophe. We cannot allow unanticipated contingencies to force our leadership to send under trained and under resourced units to fight. The risk is too high, not only for the potential for the United States to not achieve its objectives, but also the potential loss of America’s most precious commodity, the United States Soldier.

## End Notes

<sup>1</sup> McHugh, John M. "Army Directive 2012-08 (Army Total Force Policy)." Secretary of the Army, September 4, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Grady, John. "Goal Is Equal Split of Reserve Components, Active Force in Training Center Rotations." AUSA, October 13, 2014. [http://www.ausa.org/AM/Documents/2014/Stories/MonStory.4\\_Goal.aspx](http://www.ausa.org/AM/Documents/2014/Stories/MonStory.4_Goal.aspx).

<sup>3</sup> Loi, Marc SGT. 21 Sept 15. "Army Reserve Leaders Take on Force 2025 and Beyond." TRADOC Daily News. <http://www.tradocnews.org/>.

<sup>4</sup> Army Capabilities Integration Center, "Force 2025 and Beyond", TRADOC, accessed 12 February 2016, <http://www.arcic.army.mil/Initiatives/force-2025-beyond.aspx>

<sup>5</sup> Though the National Guard is a critical component of the Total Force and many of my conclusions and recommendations could apply to them, this paper will focus only on the Army Reserve and active Army on the changes necessary for lasting implementation of the Total Force. This is due to the narrow scope of this paper and the author's expertise residing mainly in the Army Reserve.

<sup>6</sup> MacCarley, Mark. "Get rid of the Guard and Army Reserve or use them." Accessed October 26, 2015. <http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/sites/default/files/Total%20Force%20Policy%20Article%20.3>.

<sup>7</sup> Highlights of a GAO Forum: Mergers and Transformation: Lessons Learned for a Department of Homeland Security and Other Federal Agencies." United States General Accounting Office, November 2002.1

<sup>8</sup> Talley, Jeffery W. LTG. LTG Talley Written Testimony to the Senate Appropriations Committee, 30 April 2014. Washington D.C., 2014.2.

<sup>9</sup> Schein, Edgar H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. 4th ed. San Francisco: San Francisco : Jossey-Bass, 2010.292.

<sup>10</sup> Schein, Edgar H. "Culture: The Missing Concept in Organizational Studies." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (1996): 229.

<sup>11</sup> Asch, Beth J., and James R. Hosek. Looking to the Future: What Does Transformation Mean for Military Manpower and Personnel Policy? *Occasional Paper / Rand Corporation OP-108-OSD*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2004.21.

<sup>12</sup> Murray, Williamson. "Does Military Culture Matter?" *Orbis* 43, no. 1 (1999): 27

<sup>13</sup> Hillen, John. "The Future of American Military Culture: Must U.S. Military Culture Reform?" *Orbis*, no. Winter 1999 (n.d.): 45.

<sup>14</sup> Gerras, Stephen J., and Leonard Wong. *Changing Minds in the Army: Why It Is so Difficult and What to Do about It*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press, 2013.3.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.goarmy.com/about/serving-in-the-army/serve-your-way/army-reserve.html>

<sup>16</sup> Committee on the Assessment of the Readjustment Needs of Military Personnel, Veterans, and Their Families; Board on the Health of Select Populations; Institute of Medicine. *Returning Home from Iraq and Afghanistan: Assessment of Readjustment Needs of Veterans, Service Members, and Their Families*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2013. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/13499>.

<sup>17</sup> Mock, Paul. Statement of Paul Mock, National Chair, Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve. Long Beach, California, 2015. <http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/reading-room/artifact-tags/statement-paul-mock-national-chair-employer-support-guard-and-reserve.1>.

<sup>18</sup> Headquarters, United States Army Reserve Command. "US Army Reserve Military Technician Information Handbook." Fort McPherson, GA: United States Army Reserve Command, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G1 Military Technician Branch, November 20, 2002. VI-7.

<sup>19</sup> While it is technically possible to terminate Mil Techs, it has been my experience that many Army Reservists feel that, because of the time and paperwork involved, that it is not worth the effort.

<sup>20</sup> The S1 "is the principal staff officer for all matters concerning human resources support (military and civilian). The G-1 (S-1) also serves as the senior adjutant general officer in the command." At General Officer commands the position is known as the G1 or the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, Personnel, (ATTP 5-0.1, 14 Sept 2011,pg 2-6)

<sup>21</sup> The G3, also known as the Assistant Chief of Staff, G3, Operations “is the primary staff officer for integrating and synchronizing the organization’s operation as a whole for the commander. In addition to coordinating the activities of the movement and maneuver warfighting function, the operations officer ensures integration and synchronization across the planning horizons in current operations, future operations, and plans integrating cells.” (ATTP 5-0.1, 14 Sept 2011, pg 2-8)

<sup>22</sup> TPU, or Troop Program Unit denotes that a Soldier is a part time traditional reservist, typically serving one weekend a month and two weeks annually.

<sup>23</sup> Battle Assemblies or BA’s are the monthly training events normally conducted on the weekend. Annual Training or AT is the statutory 14 days of active duty every year. Both events are where soldiers train on improving their readiness in individual and collective tasks in order to prepare in case of mobilization.

<sup>24</sup> OPTEMPO is an acronym for Operational tempo

<sup>25</sup> Due to readiness problems identified for RC units during Desert Storm, Congress inserted provisions under Title XI into the 1993 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which directed the Active Component to provide support to the pre and post mobilization training of the RC.

<sup>26</sup> 1st Army. “2015 1st Army Brochure.” 1 Rock Island Arsenal, Bldg. 68 Rock Island, IL 61299-5000: 1st Army, April 2, 2015.5.

<sup>27</sup> Gephhardt, LTC Paul (Army AGR and Air War College student), and LTC George Soubassis (Army AGR and Air War College student). Interview by the author, September 15, 2015

<sup>28</sup> Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. “*Transforming the National Guard and Reserves into a 21-st Century Operational Force*” (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2008) .321.

<sup>29</sup> MacCarley, Mark. “Get rid of the Guard and Army Reserve or use them.” 3.

<sup>30</sup> Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. ““*Transforming the National Guard and Reserves*” .328.

<sup>31</sup> Binnendijk, Hans, Michael J. Baranick, Raymond E. Bell Jr, Gina Cordero, Stephen M. Duncan, Christopher Holshek, and Larry Wentz. “Transforming the Reserve Component: Four Essays.” DTIC Document, 2005. <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA435065.22>.

<sup>32</sup> Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. ““*Transforming the National Guard and Reserves*” 327.

<sup>33</sup> TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-1, The Army Operating Concept, Win in a Complex World, 31 October 2014.

17.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. 328.

<sup>35</sup> Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. ““*Transforming the National Guard and Reserves*” 328.

<sup>36</sup> Binnendijk, Baranick, Bell, Cordero, Duncan, Holshek, Wentz. “Transforming the Reserve Component”.24

<sup>37</sup> MacCarley. “Get rid of the Guard” 13.

<sup>38</sup> Currently there is only one operational multicomponent unit in the Army Reserve, the 377<sup>th</sup> Theater Sustainment Command located in New Orleans, LA. There are a few other multicomponent units such as the XVIII Corps Headquarters at Fort Bragg, North Carolina and, pursuant to HQDA EXORD 062-15 Corps and Division Multi-Component Unit (MCU) Headquarters Pilot Implementation, in mid-2015, the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault).

<sup>39</sup> Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. “Commission on the National Guard and Reserves.326

<sup>40</sup> Stevens, Larry. “Maj. Gen. Mark A. Graham, FORSCOM G3, Retires.” [www.army.mil](http://www.army.mil/article/80186/Maj_Gen_Mark_A_Graham_FORSCOM_G3_retires_/), May 21, 2012. [http://www.army.mil/article/80186/Maj\\_Gen\\_Mark\\_A\\_Graham\\_FORSCOM\\_G3\\_retires\\_/](http://www.army.mil/article/80186/Maj_Gen_Mark_A_Graham_FORSCOM_G3_retires_/).

<sup>41</sup> Visot, Luis MG, former Chief of Staff, United States Army Reserve Command, Fort Bragg, NC, to the author. Email, 10 Dec 15.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Talley, Jeffery W. LTG. LTG Talley Written Testimony to the Senate Appropriations Committee, 30 April 2014. Washington D.C., 2014.2

<sup>46</sup> Grady, John. "Goal Is Equal Split of Reserve Components, Active Force in Training Center Rotations."

<sup>47</sup> Phillips, Jeffrey E. "Statement of Executive Director".4.



## Bibliography

1st Army. "2015 1st Army Brochure." 1 Rock Island Arsenal, Bldg. 68 Rock Island, IL 61299-5000: 1st Army, April 2, 2015.

———. "Army Total Force Policy: Fully Integrating the Operational Reserve." Association of the United States Army, December 2012.

———. "Continuity and Change, the Army Operating Concept." Air War College, Maxwell AFB, December 3, 2015.

Asch, Beth J., and James R. Hosek. Looking to the Future: What Does Transformation Mean for Military Manpower and Personnel Policy? Occasional Paper / Rand Corporation OP-108-OSD. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2004.

Army Capabilities Integration Center, "Force 2025 and Beyond", TRADOC, accessed 12 February 2016, <http://www.arcic.army.mil/Initiatives/force-2025-beyond.aspx>

Baldwin, Joseph R. "The Army's Operational Reserve Force." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 2010.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA522014>.

Bellamy, Oliver. "The Role of the Reserve Component in Transformation and Its Effects on Active Component/Reserve Component Integration." Edited by Army War College Carlisle Barracks, 2002.

Binnendijk, Hans, Michael J. Baranick, Raymond E. Bell Jr, Gina Cordero, Stephen M. Duncan, Christopher Holshek, and Larry Wentz. "Transforming the Reserve Component: Four Essays." DTIC Document, 2005.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA435065>.

Bond, Patrick. "Transformation, A Stronger Army Reserve." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 2009.

Bouwman, Christa HS. "The Role of Corporate Culture in Mergers & Acquisitions." Mergers and Acquisitions: Practices, Performance and Perspectives, NOVA Science Publishers, 2013. [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2307740](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2307740).

Bublitz, Gary T. "US Army Reserve Components: Restructuring to Meet the Needs of the 21st Century." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 1996.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA309109>.

Burks, Glenn LTC, George LTC Mason, Richard LTC Rollins, and Roger LTC Suro. "From Total Force to One Force: Closing the Army's Component Gaps." Cambridge. MA: Harvard Kennedy School of Government, May 16, 2013.

Cage, Steven D. "The US Army Reserve's Military Technician Program: It Can Be Optimized for Success." DTIC Document, 2000.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA378245>.

Carafano, James Jay. "The Army Reserves and the Abrams Doctrine: Unfulfilled Promise, Uncertain Future," 2005. [http://s3.amazonaws.com/thf\\_media/2005/pdf/hl869.pdf](http://s3.amazonaws.com/thf_media/2005/pdf/hl869.pdf).

Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. "Commission on the National Guard and Reserves: Transforming the National Guard and Reserves into a 21st Century Operational Force." Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC January 31, 2008.

Curthoys, Kathleen. "Gen. Mark Milley: More Training; Put 'Teeth' Into Total Army Concept." *Defense News*, October 13, 2015. <http://www.defensenews.com/story/defense/show-daily/ausa/2015/10/13/milley-more-training-put-teeth-into-total-army-concept/73881752/>.

Daily Jr, Edward. "The Total Force Policy and Utilization of the Army National Guard: Does the Application Adhere to Policy?" Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 1998. <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA342756>.

Downey, Chris. "The Total Force Policy and Effective Force." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 2004. <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA424059>.

Elan, Seth, and Alice R Buchalter. "Historical Attempts to Reorganize the Reserve Components." Washington D.C.: Federal Research Division Library of Congress, 2007. [https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/pdf-files/CNGR\\_Reorganization-Reserve-Components.pdf](https://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/pdf-files/CNGR_Reorganization-Reserve-Components.pdf).

Everstine, Brian. "Force Structure Commission Meeting Reopens Old Wounds." Edited by Aaron Mehta 73, no. 49 (2013): 20.

Fautua, David T. "How the Guard and Reserve Will Fight in 2025." *Parameters* 29, no. 1(Spring 1999): 127–49.

Feidler, Bob. "A More Affordable Military." *The Officer* 89, no. 2 (April 2013): 16–18.

———. "DoD Total Force Policy Matures." *The Officer* 89, no. 2 (April 2013): 39–43.

Francis Harvey, and Peter J. Schoomaker. "2005 Army Posture Statement." Washington, D.C., February 6, 2005. <http://www.army.mil/aps/05/addendum.html>.

GAO. "Highlights of a GAO Forum: Mergers and Transformation: Lessons Learned for a Department of Homeland Security and Other Federal Agencies." United States General Accounting Office, November 2002.

Gates, Robert M. "DoD Directive 1200\_7\_Managing the Reserve Components as an Operational Force" Department of Defense, October 29, 2008.

Gebehardt, Paul E. LTC. Email to the author. November 6, 2015.

Gerras, Stephen J., and Leonard Wong. *Changing Minds in the Army: Why It Is so Difficult and What to Do about It*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press, 2013.

Gerras, Stephen J., Leonard Wong, and Charles D. Allen. "Organizational Culture: Applying a Hybrid Model to the US Army." DTIC Document, 2008. <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA596601>.

Golding, Heidi L., J. Michael Gilmore, and Matthew S. Goldberg. "The Effects of Reserve Call-Ups on Civilian Employers." DTIC Document, 2005.

<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA59634>  
7.

Grady, John. "Goal Is Equal Split of Reserve Components, Active Force in Training Center Rotations." AUSA, October 13, 2014.  
[http://www.usa.org/AM/Documents/2014/Stories/MonStory4\\_Goal.aspx](http://www.usa.org/AM/Documents/2014/Stories/MonStory4_Goal.aspx).

Hammond, Jeffery W. "The Total Force Policy: What's Wrong in the Army." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 1998.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA33916>  
8.

Headquarters, United States Army Reserve Command. "US Army Reserve Military Technician Information Handbook." Fort McPherson, GA: United States Army Reserve Command, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, G1 Military Technician Branch, November 20, 2002.

Hillen, John. "The Future of American Military Culture: Must U.S. Military Culture Reform?" *Orbis*, no. Winter 1999 (n.d.): 43–57.

Jacobs, Jeffery A. "Transforming Army Reserve Senior Leadership a Cultural Change." *Army Magazine*, March 2005, 15–16.

Judson, Jen. "Army Commission Takes Close Look at Possible Multi-Component Aviation Units." *Defense News*, November 20, 2015.  
<http://www.defensenews.com/story/defense/land/army/2015/11/19/army-commission-takes-close-look-at-possible-multi-component-aviation-units/76072788/>.

Loi, Marc SGT. "Army Reserve Leaders Take on Force 2025 and Beyond." *TRADOC Daily News*, 21 Sept 15. <http://www.tradocnews.org/>.

MacCarley, Mark. "Get Rid of the Guard and Army Reserve or Use Them. Suggested Steps Forward to Truly Integrate the Active Army, Guard, and Army Reserve into One Army to Optimize Readiness and Enhance National Security." Accessed October 26, 2015.  
[http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/sites/default/files/Total%20Force%20Policy%20Article%20\(Full\).pdf](http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/sites/default/files/Total%20Force%20Policy%20Article%20(Full).pdf).

Mann, Morgan. "The Reserve Component." *Marine Corps Gazette* 97, no. 8 (August 2013): 57–58.

McCarthy, Dennis M. "Does the Pentagon Still Believe in the Abrams Doctrine?" *The Officer* 82, no. 1 (February 2006): 40–42.

McCullough, Amy. "Out of Reserve (Air Force Reserve Command)" 94, no. 12 (2011): 40.

McHugh, John M. "Army Directive 2012-08 (Army Total Force Policy)." Secretary of the Army, September 4, 2012.

Mehta, Aaron. "Commission: Move Manpower into Reserve, Guard Components." *Air Force Times*, February 10, 2014.

Mitchell Lee Marks. "Managing Culture Clash in Mergers and Acquisitions." Accessed October 26, 2015. <http://watercoolernewsletter.com/managing-culture-clash-in-mergers-and-acquisitions/>.

Mock, Paul. Statement of Paul Mock, National Chair, Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve. Long Beach, California, 2015. <http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/reading-room/artifact-tags/statement-paul-mock-national-chair-employer-support-guard-and-reserve>.

Murray, Williamson. "Does Military Culture Matter?" *Orbis* 43, no. 1 (1999): 27.

Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. "National Commission on the Future of the Army Operation Subcommittee Report 17 Dec 15," n.d.

Office of Army Reserve History. “Concise History Brochure\_FA\_revised April 2013\_web version.” United States Army Reserve Command, 2013.  
[http://www.usar.army.mil/Portals/98/Documents/historycorner/Concise%20History%20Brochure\\_FA\\_revised%20April%202013\\_web%20version.pdf](http://www.usar.army.mil/Portals/98/Documents/historycorner/Concise%20History%20Brochure_FA_revised%20April%202013_web%20version.pdf).

Phillips, Jeffrey E. Statement of Executive Director Jeffery E. Phillips of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States before the Commission on the Future of the Army. Arlington, VA, 2015.

Phipps, Michael A. “The Army Reserve: Relevant Today, More Relevant Tomorrow.” Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 2006.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA448691>.

Rear Admiral David O. Anderson, and Rear Admiral J. A. Winnefeld. “Navy’s Reserve Will Be Integrated with Active Forces.” Military.com, September 2004.  
[http://www.military.com/NewContent/0,13190,NI\\_1104\\_Reserve,00.html](http://www.military.com/NewContent/0,13190,NI_1104_Reserve,00.html).

Reserve Forces Policy Board (RFPB). “Reserve Component Use, Balance, Cost and Savings\_A Response to Questions from the Secretary of Defense.” Accessed October 21, 2015.  
<http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/sites/default/files/RFPB%20Reserve%20Component%20Use%20Balance%2C%20Cost%20and%20Savings%20Final%20Signed%20Report%20without%20Slides.pdf>.

Richard Sisk. “Army Needs Reservists to Meet Threats from Russia, China: Milley.” Military.com, October 13, 2015. <http://m.military.com/daily-news/2015/10/13/army-needs-reservists-to-meet-threats-from-russia-china-milley.html?ESRC=todayinmil.sm>.

Rolfse, Bruce. “‘Total Force’ Hits Cruising Speed - To Forge Active-Duty, Guard and Reserve Partnerships, ‘communicate’” *Air Force Times*, May 21, 2007, 16.

Schein, Edgar H. “Culture: The Missing Concept in Organizational Studies.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (1996): 229–40.

Schein, Edgar H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass Business & Management Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.  
<https://aufric.idm.oclc.org/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=114561&site=ehost-live&scope=site&custid=airuniv>.

Schubert, Frank N., and Theresa L. Kraus. The Whirlwind War, The United States Army in Operations DESERT SHIELD and DESERT STORM. U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2012. <http://www.history.army.mil/books/www/Wwindx.htm>.

Smith, David A. “The Operational Reserve.” *The Officer* 83, no. 5 (June 2007): 36–38.

Smith, David A, and Clarence Lee Walker. “Department of Defense Total Force Integration.” *The Officer* 82, no. 6 (August 2006): 45–48.

Snider, Don M. “An Uninformed Debate on Military Culture.” *Orbis* 43, no. 1 (1999): 11.

Stevens, Larry. “Maj. Gen. Mark A. Graham, FORSCOM G3, Retires.” [www.army.mil](http://www.army.mil/article/80186/Maj_Gen_Mark_A_Graham_FORSCOM_G3_retires), May 21, 2012.  
[http://www.army.mil/article/80186/Maj\\_Gen\\_Mark\\_A\\_Graham\\_FORSCOM\\_G3\\_retires](http://www.army.mil/article/80186/Maj_Gen_Mark_A_Graham_FORSCOM_G3_retires)

Talley, Jeffery W. LTG. LTG Talley Written Testimony to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Washington D.C., 2014.

Talley, Jeffery W. LTG, CW5 Phyllis Wilson, and CSM Luther Thomas Jr. "Army Reserve Posture Statement 2015." Washington D.C.: United States Army Reserve, March 17, 2015.

Talley, Jeffrey W. LTG. "Written Statement to the National Commission on the Future of the Army," May 19, 2015.

Tucker, Lora L. "Army Reserve Culture: A Critical Part of Transformation." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 2008.  
<http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA478526>.

TRADOC Pamphlet 525-3-1, *The Army Operating Concept, Win in a Complex World*, 31 October 2014.

Visot, Luis MG. "AC/RC BN Command," Email to author. 10 Dec 15.

Wada, Debra S. Hon Deb Wada Statement for the Record. Arlington, VA, 2015.  
<http://www.ncfa.ncr.gov/sites/default/files/Hon%20Deb%20Wada%20Statement%20for%20the%20Record%2C%20NATCOM%2C%2016%20Jul%2015.pdf>.

Warren, Jonathan. "Air Force Organizational Transformation: Merging the Active and Reserve Components." Carlisle Barracks: Army War College, 2005.

Wormuth, Christine E., Michele A. Flournoy, Patrick T. Henry, and Clark A. Murdock. "The Future of the National Guard and Reserves." The Beyond Goldwater-Nichols Phase III Report, (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies), 2006.  
[http://orchestratingpower.org/Chapter10/BGN/2006,07\\_bgn\\_ph3\\_report.pdf](http://orchestratingpower.org/Chapter10/BGN/2006,07_bgn_ph3_report.pdf).